

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports

Animal Science Department

January 2000

Growth Implants for Heifers

Terry L. Mader

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, tmader1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscinbcr>

 Part of the [Animal Sciences Commons](#)

Mader, Terry L., "Growth Implants for Heifers" (2000). *Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports*. 378.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/animalscinbcr/378>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Beef Cattle Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Feed conversion numerically decreased ($P = .22$) from Sorts 1 through 4.

Both the large-pen and individually fed studies provide useful information concerning sorting of finished feedlot cattle. The results from the large-pen study suggest leaner cattle within a pen were lighter weight going on feed and at market time. The leaner cattle may have received a premium for yield grade, but would have received substantial discounts for quality grade. Although feed efficiency cannot be calculated, the average daily gains suggest it may have been profitable to feed the leaner groups of cattle for additional days. The results of the individually fed study provides information regarding the feed efficiencies of leaner cattle within a pen. Leaner cattle at slaughter tended to be more efficient, which is logical because fat takes more energy to deposit than lean tissue.

It is important to note although feed efficiency of leaner cattle is greater than their fatter pen-mates at slaughter, the feed efficiency of these leaner cattle will decrease if they are fed longer. In order

to estimate the magnitude of this decrease, we summarized data from 57 pens of cattle which were randomly slaughtered at two time points. These data include pens of calf-fed and yearling steers and heifers. On average, cattle were slaughtered at 87 and 124 days on feed. Twelfth rib fat depths were .35 and .46, respectively, resulting in .003 inch/day rate of fattening. Feed/gain was 7.44 and 7.58, respectively. We calculate that whole feeding period feed/gain would increase by .171% or .013 units per one hundredth inch increase in fat depth. Based on these data, whole feeding period feed/gain would increase by .36% or .03 units per additional week on feed.

Adjusted feed conversions for the individually fed study are shown in Table 2. We chose .43 inches fat depth of group 2 as the target and adjusted feed conversion of the other groups, based on the calculations above, as if they had been sorted and fed for different days in order to achieve this fat depth. Based on our calculated rate of fattening, group 1 would have been marketed approximately 47 days prior to group 2, while

groups 3 and 4 would have been fed for 30 and 60 days longer than group 2, respectively. The overall feed/gain for the entire pen increased from 6.17 to 6.22. However, assuming same intakes, 36 more live lb per animal in the entire pen would be sold. In addition, averaged across the pen, cattle grading Choice or better would increase by 10 percentage units (2000 Nebraska Beef Report, pp. 20-22).

Overall conclusions are that leaner cattle within a pen are likely performing better than their fatter pen-mates at slaughter, and therefore, may benefit from additional days on feed. In these two data sets, the leanest cattle within a pen do not appear to be poor performers. Therefore, sorting or topping-off a pen a cattle at market time should increase the overall return for the pen if they are sold on a value based marketing system.

¹Rob Cooper, research technician, Terry Klopfenstein, professor, Todd Milton, assistant professor, Animal Science, Lincoln.

Growth Implants for Heifers

Terry Mader¹

Synovex® Plus™ improves gain and efficiency in feedlot heifers.

Summary

In a 110-d experiment, feedlot heifers (mean initial weight = 820 lb) that received an estradiol benzoate (EB) + trenbolone acetate (TBA) implant, Synovex® Plus™, gained faster and more efficiently than sham-implanted (control) heifers. Heifers that received only TBA implants had lower intakes and lower quality grades than control heifers, but were more efficient in feed conversion than control and EB implanted heifers. On the basis of improved yield grade and larger ribeye areas, along with no increases in fatness, the combined use of EB and TBA

provided for greater quantities of lean meat from higher priced cuts than did control or other implant groups.

Introduction

The use of products that promote growth through hormonal activity has received much attention in recent years. Trenbolone acetate (TBA), a synthetic anabolic androgen, stimulates growth and enhances feed efficiency as do implants that have estrogenic activity (Ralgro®, Synovex®-S, Implus® and Compudose®). However, because androgenic and estrogenic products tend to have different mechanisms of action, the combination of TBA and estrogen have been shown to act additively. Synovex® Plus™, a combination product containing 28 mg estradiol benzoate (EB) and 200 mg TBA, has been shown to be an effective implant in steers, particularly

when used in feedlot cattle about 100 days prior to slaughter. The objective of this study was to evaluate Synovex® Plus™ for use in feedlot heifers.

Procedure

Three hundred fourteen British x continental crossbred heifers were purchased in early July. Cattle were immunized against *Clostridial* diseases and *Haemophilus somnus* (Fermicon 7/Somnugen™) and bovine rhinotracheitis/parainfluenza/respiratory syncytial virus (BRSV Vac®), dewormed with fenbendazole (Safe-Guard® pellets), treated for external parasites (Tiguvon®), checked for pregnancy and examined for the presence of previous implants. Twenty-six animals were excluded from the pool of animals for any one or more of the following reasons: 1) too heavy or

(Continued on next page)

too light for the preferred weight range, 2) signs of injury or disease (pinkeye, BVD, etc.) 3) the animal had short ears, 4) the animal was a freemartin, 5) breed type was not appropriate (dairy cross), and 6) animals were randomly excluded. Heifers (288) were assigned to one of nine weight blocks. Within block, heifers were stratified by weight and randomly allocated to four pens which were randomly assigned the following treatments: 1) control (sham implanted); 2) 28 mg estradiol benzoate (EB); 3) 200 mg trenbolone acetate (TBA); and 4) Synovex® Plus (28 mg EB + 200 mg TBA).

On the day the trial began (d 0), heifers were weighed, implanted according to treatment assignment, and placed in designated pens. Initial weight was based on the average of weights taken over two consecutive days. During the receiving period, heifers were stepped up to finishing feedlot diets. At the start of the study, heifers were fed a 62.1 NEg Mcal/cwt diet, which subsequently was adjusted to a 65.0 NEg Mcal/cwt finishing diet which contained (DM basis): 7% alfalfa hay, 85% dry rolled corn, 3% soybean meal and 5% liquid supplement. Diets contained (DM basis) 13.4% crude protein. No ionophores or antibiotics were fed. During the trial, one heifer implanted with TBA died of bloat. At the end of the 110-d feeding period, heifers were weighed and shipped for slaughter. Liver abscess scores, masculinity scores, and hot carcass weights were recorded the day of slaughter. Additional carcass data were obtained after a 24-h chill. Adjusted final weights used for performance calculations were computed from hot carcass weight, assuming a 62% dressing percentage.

Data were analyzed as a randomized complete block design using analysis of variance procedures with weight block and implant treatment as independent variables in the model. Protected LSD's were used as the mean separation technique.

Results

Heifers that received TBA or Synovex® Plus™ had greater ($P < .10$)

Table 1. Summary of heifer performance over a 110-day feeding trial comparing implant treatments.^a

Item	Control	EB	TBA	EB + TBA
No. head	72	72	71	72
No. pens	9	9	9	9
Initial wt., lb	822	821	819	816
Average daily gain, lb/day ^b	2.78 ^c	2.90 ^{c,d}	2.98 ^d	3.06 ^d
DM intake (DMI), lb/day ^b	20.08 ^d	20.07 ^d	19.25 ^c	19.90 ^{c,d}
Feed efficiency, DMI/gain ^f	7.25 ^e	6.92 ^{d,e}	6.49 ^c	6.52 ^{c,d}
Final wt., lb ^b	1129 ^c	1142 ^{c,d}	1148 ^d	1157 ^d

^aControl heifers were sham implanted, EB = 28 mg estradiol benzoate and TBA = 200 mg trenbolone acetate.

^bAdjusted to a common dress of 62%

^{c,d,e}Means with different superscripts differ ($P < .10$)

^fDMI/gain was analyzed as gain/DMI.

Table 2. Summary of heifer carcass data comparing implant treatments.

Item	Control	EB	TBA	EB + TBA
Hot carcass weight, lb	700 ^b	708 ^{b,c}	712 ^c	718 ^c
Actual dress, %	62.2	62.1	62.2	62.7
KPH fat, % of carcass	2.19 ^c	2.06 ^b	2.05 ^b	2.06 ^b
Ribeye area, in ²	13.0 ^b	13.4 ^{b,c}	13.5 ^c	14.0 ^d
Estimated fat thickness, in	0.49	0.50	0.51	0.48
Marbling score ^e	507 ^c	452 ^b	447 ^b	442 ^b
Choice + Prime, % ^f	86.2	72.2	67.6	73.2
Color score ^g	4.96	4.82	4.74	4.97
Masculinity score ^h	4.85	4.92	4.88	4.86
Final yield grade ⁱ	2.66 ^c	2.58 ^{b,c}	2.55 ^{b,c}	2.37 ^b
Liver abscesses, %	5.6	9.7	19.7	13.9

^aControl heifers were sham implanted, EB = 28 mg estradiol benzoate and TBA = 200 mg trenbolone acetate.

^{b,c,d}Means with different superscripts differ ($P < .10$).

^eMarbling score of 400 = Small, 500 = Modest, 600 = Moderate.

^fTBA significantly different than control ($P < .10$) based on Chi-square analysis.

^gColor score of 4 = light cherry red, 5 = cherry red, 6 = dark red.

^hMasculinity score of 1 = least masculine, 9 = most masculine

ⁱFinal yield grade = $2.50 + (2.50 \times \text{estimated fat thickness}) + (.20 \times \text{percent KPH}) + (.0038 \times \text{hot carcass weight}) - (.32 \times \text{ribeye area})$.

gains and final weights than control heifers (Table 1). Dry matter intakes (DMI) by TBA-implanted heifers were lower ($P < .10$) than DMI by control and EB-implanted heifers. Compared to controls, all implanted heifers had lower feed to gain ratios ($P < .10$). However, heifers implanted with only TBA had lower ($P < .10$) feed to gain ratios than heifers implanted with only EB.

Implanted heifers had lower ($P < .10$) % KPH and marbling scores than control heifers (Table 2), while heifers implanted with TBA or Synovex® Plus™ had greater ($P < .10$) ribeye areas than control heifers. Heifers that received only TBA had lower quality grade (% Choice and Prime) than control heifers. Ribeye color and masculinity scores did not differ between control and implanted heifers. Only heifers implanted with Synovex® Plus™ had lower yield grade

than control heifers, while heifers receiving only TBA implants tended to have a greater incidence of liver abscesses than control heifers. This is opposite to trends found in a previous study (1996 NE Beef Report, pp. 71) in which non-implanted cattle tended to have a greater incidence of liver abscesses than implanted cattle. The greater overall incidence of liver abscesses could likely be attributed to the absence of a feed-grade antibiotic fed to control abscesses. Data suggest Synovex® Plus™ implants effectively improve gain and feed efficiency in crossbred feedlot heifers without significantly altering color or masculinity score.

¹Terry Mader, professor, Animal Science Northeast Research and Extension Center, Concord.